## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

AISHA COOKS-PUTNAM,	) Case No. 2:15-cv-01166-GMN-NJK
Plaintiff(s), vs. TRUMP LAS VEGAS CORP., et al.,	ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN
Defendant(s).	) (Docket No. 17) )

On August 7, 2015, the Court ordered the parties to show cause why they failed to comply with the deadline for submitting a discovery plan or, alternatively, to submit a discovery plan. Docket No. 14. Now pending before the Court is a discovery plan that provides a schedule for moving the case forward "should the case not be remanded" to state court. See Docket No. 17 at 2. Hence, it appears the parties seek a de facto stay of discovery pending resolution of the motion to remand. The fact that a motion to remand has been filed does not, standing alone, entitle the parties to forego their discovery obligations. See, e.g., Long v. Aurora Bank, FSB, 2012 WL 2076842, \*1 (D. Nev. June 8, 2012). If the parties seek a stay of discovery pending resolution of that motion, they must file a stipulation or motion seeking that relief and addressing the relevant standards. See id.; see also Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013). The proposed discovery plan is hereby **DENIED**. No later than August 20, 2015, the parties shall either file an appropriate request to stay discovery or a proposed discovery plan that is not contingent on the resolution of the motion to remand.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 13, 2015

NANCY J. KO

United States Magistrate Judge